

## SURVEY RESULTS

1. One of the major objectives of the PMPB Reassessment Team was to obtain input from as many of the 37,729 USACE team members as possible by making available a survey on the World Wide Web. The survey portion of the assessment was four phased: (1) Preliminary Announcement (See Attachment 1--PMBPSPA.gif); (2) Survey (See Attachments 2 & 3--PMBPS.ipg & PMBPSC.gif); (3) Interpretation (See Attachment 4--PMBPSD.gif); and (4) Reports<sup>1</sup> (See Attachments 5 & 6--PMPBSF.xls & PMBPS.mdb).

2. In actuality, the preliminary announcement reached just over 14,000 USACE team members (37%). The survey site was visited by just over 10,000 discrete USACE team members (26.5%). Of the 10,000 viewers, 2,975 team members completed the survey<sup>2</sup>. Thus total survey respondents number 2.65% of the total Army Corps' Team. While the PMBP reassessment survey failed to meet participation objectives, it did have the highest response rate of any survey to date. The lower than projected participation was attributed to two causes: (1) at the time of the survey the USACE lacked an e-mail broadcast button. Therefore all e-mail traffic intended for distribution to all Army Corps' employees had to pass a minimum of three filters. As a result of the PMBP Reassessment Team's corrective actions, a broadcast button has been developed. (2) Failed coordination at USACE HQ resulted in two other PMBP surveys (one standard hardcopy survey and one interview conducted) being conducted at exactly the same time as this web based survey. These multiple PMBP surveys were interpreted as duplicative efforts at many subordinate levels of USACE. Even this potentially negative situation allowed for a positive outcome as the team was able to conduct cost comparisons of the surveys and make a determination that the web based survey resulted in a cost avoidance of over \$20,000.

3. Links to the Recommendations:

3.1. **"Retain the USACE Strategic Vision"** A quick review of the survey respondents answers demonstrates that the content and intent of the Corp Strategic Vision has permeated the thinking of our team members. It is obvious that the vision has taken roots within the organization, to change or replace it would take an inordinate investment of resources.

3.2.a. **"Change the first imperative in ER 5-1-11 to read "All work is an integral part of project delivery"** The survey confirmed the team visit findings that differences in semantics were allowing many USACE personnel to consider ER 5-1-11 requirements to exclude them.

3.2.b. **"Establish the Project Delivery Team (PDT) as the foundational unit for performing all work. Change the title of the ER and PMBP to the "USACE Project Delivery Process" (USACE-PDP"** Survey respondents overwhelmingly supported the use of teams. However over 65% felt ER 5-1-11, Program and Project Management did not apply to them or their work, but rather to the "M stovepipe".

3.3. **"Stand down immediately all USACE policies (regulations, circulars, directives, letters, memoranda, and operating procedures). Establish a standing Project Delivery Team (PDT), reporting directly to the DCG, to review and revise all policies for consistency with the USACE-PDP"** One central theme of survey respondent comments was the lack of consistency in policy and guidance originated by higher headquarters. Many felt these disparities to be resulting in much confusion and reduced productivity at the working level.

3.4. **"Indoctrinate the entire workforce in the USACE-PDP"** The disparity of survey comment responses indicate a lack of basic doctrine and understanding of PMBP throughout the USACE community.

3.5. **"Empower Commanders to effect high-graded development assignments within their command, pending concurrence of the senior rater at the next higher level"** Survey respondents clearly understood the concept that senior staff could stagnate. Leaders in charge of a single function (e.g., logistics, personnel, etc) tend to add increasing value to organizations in the first 3-5 years. They operate in the "first S" where the advantage to the organization is stability. Their individual styles and approach are key to solving big challenges that reap great benefit to the organization. After a while they have solved all the challenges for which their style or approach works; it is then that the later two S's can set in. This does not mean they have not done good job - they have. But things begin to stagnate once they enter the last two S's. Many respondent comments centered on stagnation and resistance to change.

3.6. **"Direct a synchronized and integrated implementation of the USACE-PDP"** Many survey comments highlighted how PMBP implementation within their organizations had been hit or miss. Few felt it had been properly implemented to facilitate increased productivity.

3.7. **"Align all USACE echelons using the three groups of the USACE-PDP: Programs & Projects (Combat Arms)- Technical Services (Combat Support)- Support Services (Combat Service Support)"** The vast majority of survey respondent comments centered on the conflict between project management and technical services. Almost all felt that support services were not adding sufficient value to project delivery to justify associated cost of the services.

3.8. **"Establish at all USACE subordinate commands (Centers, Districts, and FOAs) a three tiered decision making structure consisting of Project Delivery Team (PM and subject matter experts) an Operations Board (selected middle management), and a Corporate Board (Commander and selected senior leaders)"** Many survey commentaries discussed the feeling that all echelons were focusing on project and near term decisions while nobody was focused on mid and long term strategies. The net result was a feeling that teams and members were constantly being second-guessed and that few if anybody was properly empowered.

3.9. **"Mandate all Support Services use the USACE-PDP. The Deputy Commander is responsible for Support Service"** Many who took the time to comment felt that support services had become an end to themselves. PROMIS was universally despised as were actions relating to personnel recruitment. Most felt levels of service support were less than adequate to support customer service requirements.

3.10. **"Change ER 5-1-11 dealing with quality and safety to convey: - Life Safety is non-negotiable;- Project Delivery Teams are responsible for the quality of the products & technical services; - The PDT resolves disputes over quality at the lowest echelon possible (Otherwise, the PDT, including the DPM and Technical Chief(s), will jointly present the issues to the Commander; & - The Commander has ultimate responsibility for quality and safety"** Survey respondents felt very strongly that authority for all PDT functions (scope, schedule, budget, safety, and quality) had to reside within the team and that the team leader, as a representative of the Commander had to bear ultimate responsibility for failures. Most believed that the current system had no mechanism for accountability.

<sup>1</sup> Attached are two (2) files with the PMBP Survey Data.

Make **new** directory on your **C:** drive and **"Save"** both to **same** directory.

The Excel file has 4 tabs, they are sheet protected so you can't accidentally delete.

Click on tabs across bottom to view data, as you wish.

If you wish to sort manipulate, you need to make another sheet and copy data to it.

An MS Access database is linked it to the same spreadsheet.

To use Access database file:

First, to view the MS Access file, you must have MS Access Program on your desktop. Start by double clicking on the "pmbps.mdb" in the new folder you created.

Access will start automatically.

You will see it in the Table tab a **"AccessLink Sheet in Excel"** icon. It will not work because the excel sheet is not linked.

To fix in Access, click on **"Tool"**, drop down to **"Add-Ins"** then to **"Linked Table Manager"**

Dialog box will appear, then check **"AccessLink Sheet in Excel"** then hit **"OK"**

In Access go to the **Forms** tab and click on **"HQ PMBP Survey Form View"** to see each record separately.

There is so much data, you may need to reset your monitor properties to 1024 x 768 pixel for a nicer view on screen.

At the bottom you will see arrows, click forward through the respondent entries. Click on any gray box to read more of each comment.

You can run your reports through the Reports tab, but you will have to choose what you want to see. There are many interesting ways to look the at data: by location, grade, comment, word counts, key words, etc.

<sup>2</sup> Individual surveys are best viewed using "AccessLink" with 1024 x 768 pixel for a nicer view on screen.